

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/589,155	PEDERSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chun-Kuan Lee	2181	

All Participants:

(1) Chun-Kuan Lee (Examiner).

(2) Chih-Hsin Teng (Reg. # 63,168).

Date of Interview: 5 October 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Please see Continuation Sheet below

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

The interview mainly focused on getting a clear understand of applicant's claimed invention, wherein the examiner requested the applicant to provide a real world example reflecting the heart/core of applicant's invention, and applicant in response, provided the following explanation:

A real world example would be a device receiving a data and a metadata for the data, utilized the received metadata in combination with a tree architecture to acquire a content type, and utilizing the content type to determine a corresponding executable for the data.

In response, the examiner inquired how is the utilization of the tree architecture to accomplish the functionality of identifying the executable germane to applicant's invention, and applicant responded that the utilization of the tree architecture for identifying the executable is not special, it is another/different way/option/method for identifying the executable and that no one ever thought of identifying the executable in this manner; and the examiner further inquired if the use of the tree architecture for identifying the executable is better or more efficient then how it is accomplished conventionally via metadata, and applicant responded that applicant's invention is not necessary better or more efficient, but applicant's invention is different from convention methodology.

The examiner then requested for further clarification as to what is applicant's invention, and in response, applicant stated that the invention is in the claimed language which corresponds to a different way/option/method for identifying the executable.

In summary, based on applicant's explanation above and the interview dated 06/19/2010:

"... The interview focused on getting a better understanding of the instant invention, wherein the examiner provided the following real world example for the instant invention:

Having a mobile device receiving data such as a word document, wherein the received data include metadata, and the mobile device determines to initiate the word program to read the received word document based on examining the received metadata. That is the invention is associated with utilizing the received data's metadata to determine what program/executable is call upon to render the received data ...,"

it is the examiner's best understanding that the core/heart of applicant's invention for utilizing the tree architecture to accomplish the functionality of identifying the executable is functionally equivalent to the utilization of the metadata for identifying the executable, because applicant explained that it is not special to use the tree architecture for identifying the executable as applicant's invention is providing another/different way/option/method for accomplishing the same functionality as the methodology associated with the conventional metadata.

No agreement was reached with regard to the allowability of the claims; agreement was reach with regard to the core/heart of applicant's invention.